

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 5, 9-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lurie et al (US 2002/0116698), hereinafter “Lurie” in view of Glaser et al. (US 5,953,525 A), hereinafter “Glaser”. Claims 6-8 and 14-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lurie and Glaser as applied to claims 1, 3, 5 and 9-13 above, and in view of Crudele et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,973,647 B2), hereinafter “Crudele. Claims 1,3, 5, 9, 11, 17, 22 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced via this amendment.

Interview Summary

On April 22, 2008, Examiner Khanh Pham and Applicants’ representatives, Mr. Kenneth Eiferman and Mr. Peter Hernandez, participated in a telephonic interview. During the interview, Mr. Eiferman proposed the claim amendments herein. Examiner Phamh agreed to reevaluate the pending rejections in light of the claim amendments and remarks herein.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 3, 5, 9-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lurie in view of Glaser. Claims 6-8 and 14-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lurie in view of Glaser as applied to claims 1, 3, 5 and 9-13 above and further in view of Crudele.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the current invention. Claim 1 has been amended to now recite in part that the device is a portable communication device support which can be found in paragraph [0038]. Independent claim 1 has also been amended to recite in part (additions in bold):

“associate a data project with the main device project, the data project comprising a target database property that enables the data project and its contents to be associated with the device database; and

view stored procedures and triggers stored within the data project and currently associated with the device database and to add and delete stored procedures and triggers

which are to be associated with the device database for the main device project and the device setup project;

automatically compiling the associated procedures and triggers, embedding them in the associated device database and registering them with the device database”

as well as:

“installing the device database on the *portable communication* device *according to an associated installation property* for testing of the device on which the device database is being installed”.

Support for the above additions can be found for example in paragraphs [0063], [0048] and [0065] as well as FIGs. 11 to 14. Neither the Laurie or Glasser references taken individually or in combination teach or suggest “associate a data project with the main device project, the data project comprising a target database property that enables the data project and its contents to be associated with the device database” or “automatically compiling the associated procedures and triggers, embedding them in the associated device database and registering them with the device database”. As shown for example in FIG. 11 the data project 540 is associated with the device project 520 and device database 522 via the interface. Given that neither Laurie nor Glasser teach or suggest such a structure, claim 1 and dependent claims 3 and 5-8 are in condition for allowance.

Independent claim 9 which is directed to a computer readable medium has been amended in similar fashion to independent claim 1 and is therefore also believed to be in condition for allowance along with dependent claims 10-16 which add further nonobvious features to independent claim 9.

Independent claims 17 and 22 have been amended to recite “*associating a data project with the device project, the data project comprising a target database property that enables the data project and its contents to be associated with the device database, the one or more stored procedures and triggers are stored within the data project*” and is shown for example in FIG. 11 of the present application. Given that none of the cited Laurie, Glasser nor Crudele references teach or suggest such a structure or technique, it is believed that independent claims 17 and 22 and their corresponding independent claims 18-21 and 23-26 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2791/303661.01
Application No.: 10/719,481
Office Action Dated: February 5, 2008

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: May 5, 2008

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/
Kenneth R. Eiferman
Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439